HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2371/2026

Vikramdin S/o Aas Mohammad, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village And Post Bilaspur, Tehsil Tijara, District Khairtal Tijara, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Director General Of Police Police Director Jaipur Rajasthan
2. Bank Of Baroda, Opposite Power House, Through Bank Manager, Firozpur Road, Tehsil Tijara, District Khairtal-Tijara, Rajasthan.
3. Bank Of Baroda, Zonal Office Manager, Situated At 5Th Floor, Baroda Bhawan, 13 Airport Plaza, Durgapura, Tonk Road, Jaipur 302018.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Yogesh Kairwal with Mr. Sagar Jindal
For Respondent(s)	:	Ms. Sunita Meena, AGC, with Ms. Devakriti Vashishtha, AAAG, and Mr. Kartikeya Shukla for Mr. Bhuwnesh Sharma, AAG Mr. Laxmi Kant Sharma for Mr. Ram Naresh Vijay

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUROOP SINGHI

<u>Order</u>

<u>16/02/2026</u>

1. The present writ petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

> *"In view of the foregoing facts and grounds, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be please to:*
>
> *I. Allow the present Civil Writ Petition and issue an appropriate writ, order or direction in favour of the humble Petitioner;*

II. Direct the Respondent Bank to defreeze the Petitioner's Saving Account 34598100017845, IFS CODE-BARB0TIJARA branch Tijara, Rajasthan permitting its normal operation, and in the alternative, allow the Bank to retain a lien only to the extent of the disputed transaction amount, keeping the remaining balance free and operative;

III. Pass any order or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has never misused the aforesaid bank account for the purpose of illegal transactions and has not committed any cyber crime and has no relation whatsoever to the alleged fraudulent transaction(s).

3. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the Investigating Agencies and will appear before the Bank Authorities and the Investigating Agencies as and when called upon.

4. Therefore, learned counsel prays that while the disputed amount which has been received in the petitioner's account may be frozen, the amount other than the disputed amount may kindly be allowed to be withdrawn and the petitioner may be allowed to operate and carry out the banking transactions from the said bank account.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent – Bank submits that, as per the information received, the disputed amount credited in the petitioner's bank account is Rs.10,000/- and the bank account of the petitioner has been frozen strictly in connection with on-going investigation in financial cyber fraud complaint bearing acknowledgment No.32110250033262.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent – Bank further submits that the petitioner may be directed not to discontinue the bank account until the investigation is completed or the criminal case is decided.

7. Learned counsel for the respondent – State submits that as the petitioner is the beneficiary of an amount involved in a financial cyber fraud complaint and the investigation is undergoing, no interference is called for at this stage.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees with the submissions made by learned counsel for the respondent – Bank.

9. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

10. In view of the submissions so made, this Court is of the considered view that merely because a certain amount has been transferred to the petitioner's bank account in an alleged fraudulent transaction, the act of freezing the entire bank account and imposing complete restriction on banking transactions at this stage will seriously prejudice the rights of the petitioner. At the most, the Bank can keep a lien on the amount to the extent it relates to the alleged fraudulent transaction(s) credited in the petitioner’s bank account.

11. Consequently, this writ petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the respondent – Bank to de-freeze the bank account No. 34598100017845 of the petitioner maintained at Bank of Baroda, Branch Tijara, Opp. Power House, Firojpur Road, Tijara, Rajasthan and he may be allowed to operate and carry out banking transactions in the said bank account over and above the disputed amount, in accordance with law. However, the disputed amount i.e., Rs.10,000/- which has been credited in the petitioner's bank account in connection with the alleged fraudulent transaction(s) shall remain frozen.

12. It is made clear that the petitioner will co-operate with the Bank Authorities and the Investigating Agencies and will appear before them as and when required. It is also ordered that the petitioner shall not close or discontinue the bank account till the Investigating Agencies and Bank Authorities permit the petitioner to do so.

13. It is further ordered that after investigation, if the involvement of the petitioner is found in any illegal transaction, he shall be liable to pay amount involved in the aforesaid illegal transaction and will face inquiry/investigation as per law.

14. Needless to say, that this order has been passed only in the context of de-freezing of the bank account of the petitioner and in no manner is to be construed as any determination with respect to the merits of the financial cyber fraud complaint under question.

15. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(ANUROOP SINGHI),J

DIPESH CHAYAL /32